

University of Groningen

Pre-employment examinations for preventing occupational injury and disease in workers

Mahmud, Norashikin; Schonstein, Eva; Schaafsma, Frederieke; Lehtola, Marika M.; Fassier, Jean-Baptiste; Reneman, Michiel F.; Verbeek, Jos H.

Published in:
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

DOI:
[10.1002/14651858.CD008881](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008881)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2010

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Mahmud, N., Schonstein, E., Schaafsma, F., Lehtola, M. M., Fassier, J-B., Reneman, M. F., & Verbeek, J. H. (2010). Pre-employment examinations for preventing occupational injury and disease in workers. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (12), Art. No.: CD008881-. [008881].
<https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008881>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Functional capacity evaluations for the prevention of occupational re-injuries in injured workers (Review)

Mahmud N, Schonstein E, Schaafsma F, Lehtola MM, Fassier JB, Verbeek JH, Reneman MF



**THE COCHRANE
COLLABORATION®**

This is a reprint of a Cochrane review, prepared and maintained by The Cochrane Collaboration and published in *The Cochrane Library* 2010, Issue 7

<http://www.thecochranelibrary.com>



Functional capacity evaluations for the prevention of occupational re-injuries in injured workers (Review)
Copyright © 2010 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| HEADER | 1 |
| ABSTRACT | 1 |
| PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY | 2 |
| BACKGROUND | 2 |
| OBJECTIVES | 2 |
| METHODS | 3 |
| RESULTS | 5 |
| DISCUSSION | 6 |
| AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS | 7 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 7 |
| REFERENCES | 7 |
| CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES | 8 |
| DATA AND ANALYSES | 12 |
| HISTORY | 12 |
| CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS | 12 |
| DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST | 12 |
| SOURCES OF SUPPORT | 12 |
| DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW | 13 |
| INDEX TERMS | 13 |

[Intervention Review]

Functional capacity evaluations for the prevention of occupational re-injuries in injured workers

Norashikin Mahmud¹, Eva Schonstein¹, Frederieke Schaafsma¹, Marika M Lehtola², Jean-Baptiste Fassier³, Jos H Verbeek², Michiel F Reneman⁴

¹Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, Lidcombe, Australia. ²Cochrane Occupational Health Field, Team of Knowledge Transfer in Occupational Health and Safety, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Kuopio, Finland. ³Service de Médecine et Santé au Travail, Université Claude Bernard - Lyon 1, Lyon, France. ⁴Center of Rehabilitation, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands

Contact address: Norashikin Mahmud, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, Cumberland Campus C42, 75 East St (PO Box 170), Lidcombe, NSW, 2141, Australia. nmah3154@usyd.edu.au.

Editorial group: Cochrane Injuries Group.

Publication status and date: New, published in Issue 7, 2010.

Review content assessed as up-to-date: 6 December 2009.

Citation: Mahmud N, Schonstein E, Schaafsma F, Lehtola MM, Fassier JB, Verbeek JH, Reneman MF. Functional capacity evaluations for the prevention of occupational re-injuries in injured workers. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2010, Issue 7. Art. No.: CD007290. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007290.pub2.

Copyright © 2010 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ABSTRACT

Background

Functional capacity evaluation (FCE) has been widely used to assess workers' physical state of readiness to return to work (RTW) after an injury and to make recommendations for the time and capacity in which they might return. FCEs are also used to prevent re-injury after RTW. Despite being a commonly used tool, little is known about how effective FCE is in preventing occupational injuries.

Objectives

To assess the effectiveness of FCE-based return to work recommendations in preventing occupational re-injuries of injured workers compared with no intervention or alternative interventions.

Search strategy

We searched the following electronic databases: the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (*The Cochrane Library* 2009, Issue 4), MEDLINE (1966 to December 2009), EMBASE (1980 to December 2009), CINAHL (1980 to December 2009), PsycINFO (1983 to December 2009) and PEDro (1929 to December 2009). The searches were not restricted by date, language or type of publication.

Selection criteria

We included randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of FCE-based return to work recommendations for preventing occupational re-injuries in injured workers.

Data collection and analysis

Four authors (NM, ES, JV, ML), in pairs, independently selected studies for inclusion, extracted data and assessed risk of bias.

Main results

We found no studies that compared FCE to no intervention. We found one RCT with 372 participants in which a short-form of one FCE was compared to the standard long-form FCE (Isernhagen Work Systems). Outcomes were recurrence rates of re-injuries. There was no significant difference between the two forms of FCE.

We rated the overall quality of the evidence as low.

Authors' conclusions

There is no evidence for or against the effectiveness of FCE compared to no intervention. A short version of FCE showed similar effectiveness to a long version in preventing re-injury. More RCTs are needed.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Functional capacity evaluations for preventing re-injuries in employees on returning to work

Functional capacity evaluation (FCE) is a method to assess physical capacity to perform certain tasks. It is believed that FCE can prevent re-injury if injured workers are assessed before they return to work and get proper recommendations on how to perform work tasks.

We found no studies that compared workers given FCE to workers given no intervention to evaluate the effectiveness in preventing re-injury of FCE. We found one RCT involving 372 injured workers that compared a short version of the FCE to an extensive version in which more bodily functions were tested. The short-form FCE produced a 43% reduction in physical assessment time. However, there was no difference between the two forms of FCE in terms of prevention of recurrence of occupational injuries. We therefore concluded that there is no evidence for or against the effectiveness of the length of the FCE in ensuring that those who do return will not suffer an injury relapse.

BACKGROUND

Functional capacity evaluation (FCE) is the most commonly used tool for assessing workers' capacity to perform certain tasks following injury. FCE is used to make recommendations for participation in work while considering the person's body functions and structures, environmental factors, personal factors and health status (Soer 2008, p. 394). The underlying assumption of FCE is that the injured worker's performance during this health examination, which is equal to or exceeds the physical requirements of their particular job, can lead to appropriate recommendations about when it is safe for them to return to work, what duties it is safe for them to perform, or both. It may thus reduce the risk of their re-injury upon returning to work (Isernhagen 1992; Hart 1993). Successful return to work following injury means that the worker is back at work performing pre-injury or modified tasks and does not have recurrent episodes of sickness absence.

FCE-based return to work recommendations are mainly based on physical capacities. However, return to work is a multidimensional phenomenon influenced by numerous other factors. These include personal factors such as age, previous history of pain, initial diagnosis, job satisfaction, expectations of recovery, self-efficacy

beliefs, perceptions of disability and pain tolerance (Schonstein 2001; Heijbel 2006; Asante 2007; Busch 2007). Workers' ability to choose work tasks and working hours, employers' ability to provide restricted work or different jobs and medico-legal issues also have an impact on whether or how soon workers will return to work (Allen 2004; Johansson 2004; Johansson 2006).

Given the complexity of factors influencing injured workers' return, the validity of FCE in being able to predict safe return to work and thus lower recurrence rates has been questioned (Innes 1999; Reneman 2004; Reneman 2005). Nevertheless, FCE continues to be commonly used in the rehabilitation of workers in industrialised countries, such as the USA, Canada, Australia and parts of Europe, to make judgements on injured workers' performance potential or readiness for work following work-related musculoskeletal injuries (King 1998; Wyman 1999). The effectiveness of FCE-based recommendations to prevent occupational re-injuries after return to work, however, is unknown.

OBJECTIVES

The objective of this review is to assess the effectiveness of FCE-based return to work recommendations for the prevention of occupational re-injuries of injured workers compared with no intervention or alternative interventions.

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

We considered any type of randomised controlled trial (RCT), either clustered or individual, for inclusion in this review.

Types of participants

Participants were injured workers or claimants for workers' compensation.

Types of interventions

We included any evaluation of an injured worker's physical capabilities in relation to the physical demands of the job. The intervention should consist of one or more physical capacity measures assessed by a health professional and should result in a recommendation regarding the worker's physical capacity to safely return to work. The recommendation can relate to the time the worker would be considered fit, or to the adjustments to the workplace necessary for a healthy return to work.

Types of outcome measures

We considered any re-injury outcome measures after functional evaluation of injured workers, such as the time to return to work, the number of days on sick leave and the duration of workers' compensation claims.

Search methods for identification of studies

The searches were not restricted by date, language or publication status.

Electronic searches

We searched the following electronic databases:

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (*The Cochrane Library* 2009, Issue 4)
- MEDLINE (1966 to December 2009);
- EMBASE (1980 to December 2009);

- CINAHL (1980 to December 2009);
- PsycINFO (1983 to December 2009); and
- PEDro (1929 to December 2009).

The search strategies for each database are reported in Appendix 1.

Searching other resources

We searched reference lists from relevant studies to identify potentially relevant trials.

Data collection and analysis

Four review authors, in pairs, independently conducted database searches. Two review authors (JV, ML) conducted searches for the CENTRAL, CINAHL and PsycINFO databases. NM and ES conducted searches for MEDLINE, EMBASE and PEDro. NM collected and combined the search results for the selection of studies.

Selection of studies

Two review authors (JV, ML) independently screened titles and abstracts of the potentially relevant studies found in the CENTRAL, CINAHL and PsycINFO databases. NM and ES independently screened titles and abstracts of studies found in MEDLINE, EMBASE and PEDro. We developed a standardised form for the inclusion criteria to assist authors. The inclusion criteria (Appendix 2) consisted of type of study, interventions and outcome measures. We excluded studies that did not meet the relevant inclusion criteria and documented the reasons for exclusion in the table of [Characteristics of excluded studies](#). Any disagreement on the eligibility of a trial was discussed until consensus was reached. Following this process, we obtained the full text of all articles that potentially qualified for inclusion.

Data extraction and management

We developed a standardised data extraction form and pilot tested the form on a sample of studies to ensure it was understandable, easy to complete and comprehensive. Two review authors (NM, ES) independently extracted data based on the methods, participants, interventions, outcomes and main results of each study and compared completed forms to verify agreement. Disagreements were resolved by discussion, until consensus was reached. We contacted study authors for more information when there was insufficient information in the study reports.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

In order to reduce the potential for bias, we used the checklist developed by [Downs 1998](#) to measure the included study's quality. The checklist included 13 items for internal validity (seven items for bias and six items for confounding), 10 items for reporting and three items for external validity. We reported the internal validity items in the 'Risk of bias' table in the table of [Characteristics of included studies](#) and the external validity and reporting quality items in [Table 1](#). We scored and ranked the studies according to scales of 'yes', 'no' and 'unable to determine'. Two review authors (NM, ES) conducted the assessments independently and all disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Table 1. Reporting and external validity

| Study design | | RCT |
|--------------|--|--------------|
| Study ID | | Gross (2007) |
| Reporting | | |
| 1 | Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described? | 1 |
| 2 | Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or the Methods section? | 1 |
| 3 | Are the characteristics of the participants included in the study clearly described? | 1 |
| 4 | Are the interventions of interest clearly described? (aims, content, ...) | 1 |
| 5 | Is the distribution of confounders in each group of subjects to be compared clearly described? (working condition, health status...) | 1 |
| 6 | Are the main findings of the study clearly described? | 1 |
| 7 | Does the study provide estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes? | 1 |
| 8 | Have any adverse events that may be a consequence of the intervention been reported? | 1 |
| 9 | Have the characteristics of participants lost to follow up been described? | 1 |
| 10 | Have actual probability values been reported for main outcomes instead of discreet values (e.g. 0.035 instead of < 0.05), except when less than 0.001? | 1 |

Table 1. Reporting and external validity (Continued)

| External validity | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------|
| 11 | Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited? | 1 |
| 12 | Were those subjects who were prepared to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited? | 1 |
| 13 | Were the staff, places and facilities where the participants were treated representative of the treatment the majority of workers would receive? | 1 |
| | TOTAL | 13/13 |

Grading the strength of evidence

We assessed the strength of evidence by the GRADE approach ([GRADE Working Group 2004](#)).

model. For the analysis of hazard ratios, we would have used the inverse variance method.

Measures of treatment effect

We plotted the hazard ratios with their 95% confidence intervals as the effects of treatment in the data tables in [Review Manager](#) using the inverse variance method ([Higgins 2008](#)).

Sensitivity analysis

We planned to analyse the studies by high versus low quality.

Unit of analysis issues

We intended to adjust for the cluster effect in cluster-randomised trials that had not done so in their analysis, but as we only found one study with a non-significant outcome we felt this was not necessary.

RESULTS

Description of studies

See: [Characteristics of included studies](#); [Characteristics of excluded studies](#).

Dealing with missing data

We contacted the authors if data on the outcome or risk of bias were missing ([Gross 2007](#)).

Results of the search

The initial search of the databases yielded 3340 seemingly relevant studies; 124 in CENTRAL, 233 in CINAHL, 2293 in EMBASE, 516 in MEDLINE, 159 in PEDro and 15 in PsycINFO. Once the 659 duplicates had been removed, a list of 2681 articles remained. From these, independent screening by four authors (NM, ES, JV, ML) using keywords, titles and abstracts identified 70 potentially suitable articles of which the full texts were obtained. Screening of each full-text article according to the above criteria resulted in the inclusion of one study that fulfilled the inclusion criteria ([Gross 2007](#)).

Data synthesis

We would have pooled studies with sufficient data, judged to be clinically homogeneous, with [Review Manager 5](#) software. When pooling data from medical, psychological and physical tests, we would have made sure we only pooled similar tests in our analysis. If studies were statistically heterogeneous, we would have used a random-effects model, otherwise we would have used a fixed-effect

Included studies

One randomised controlled trial involving 372 claimants undergoing FCE at the Workers' Compensation Board of Alberta rehabilitation facility (from 2004 to 2005) is included in this review. Clinicians experienced in FCE (N = 23) were randomised to either short-form or long-form FCE. The study compared the recurrence of injuries following the short-form FCE compared to the standard long-form FCE (Isernhagen Work Systems). The short-form FCE developed by Gross 2006b consists of items selected from Isernhagen Work Systems and Ruan 2001's Functional Assessment Screening Test. It provides separate region-specific protocols for measuring the physical functioning of the individual's trunk, upper extremities and lower extremities, whereby the appropriate items can be selected for a single region or, where multiple injury sites are indicated, combined to assess multiple regions, according to the participant's diagnosis. While assessors may add new items as deemed necessary, evaluation only takes four hours. In contrast, the longer standard FCE protocol includes evaluation of the worker's capacity for dynamic lifting, carrying, pushing and pulling, overhead work and walking, takes about five hours and is usually done over two days. The worker's performance observed during the assessment is compared to his/her specific physical job demands based on which a decision regarding their fitness-to-work is made.

The recurrence rates of sickness absence were measured over the period of one year following short-form or standard FCE. Recurrences refer to whether the claim was re-opened or a new claim filed after initial claim closure or whether time-loss benefits restarted after having been suspended from the period of seven days within one year after FCE. The outcome measures were evaluated in three ways:

1. recurrences of injury claim after initial benefit suspension or claim closure;
2. re-starting benefit payments after initial suspension of benefit; and
3. re-opening claims or filing a new claim after claim closure.

Excluded studies

Of the studies that were excluded after examination of the full text, we rejected eight because their designs did not fulfil our inclusion criteria (Gross 2004a; Gross 2004b; Gross 2005; Kuijer 2006; Gross 2006; Lechner 2008; Goutteborge 2009; Streibelt 2009).

Risk of bias in included studies

We assessed the included study for risk of bias according to the Downs 1998 checklist. We contacted the author for additional information whereupon four items initially scored as 'unable to determine' and 'no' were changed to 'yes'.

Internal validity: bias and confounding

The study's internal validity results are presented in the 'Risk of bias' table in the Characteristics of included studies table. From these items, the internal validity quality rating is 12/13. The study reported blinding participants from the intervention they received but the therapists were aware of which form of FCE they were conducting.

Reporting and external validity

The reporting quality was rated 10/10 and the external validity quality achieved a score of 3/3 (Table 1).

Effects of interventions

Short-form functional capacity evaluation (FCE) versus standard FCE

Recurrence rates

There was no difference in recurrence rates of re-injuries in the year following short-form FCE or standard FCE expressed in:

1. all recurrences after initial benefit suspension or claim closure (hazard ratio (HR) 1.25, 95% CI 0.79 to 1.98);
 2. re-starting benefits after initial suspension (HR 1.40, 95% CI 0.66 to 2.95); and
 3. re-opening or filing of a new claim after initial closure of claims for the same incident (HR 1.17, 95% CI 0.72 to 1.91).
- The single significant difference between the two interventions was in terms of the time required to perform the functional assessment: short-form FCE was reported to take 43% less time than standard FCE.

DISCUSSION

Summary of main results

This review found no studies that compared functional capacity evaluation (FCE) versus no intervention. We found low quality evidence based on one study that short-form FCE resulted in similar recurrence rates of sickness absence of injured workers compared to standard FCE.

Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

The single study included in the review only compared two variants of one FCE method. While the results of this comparison would suggest that there is only a time-cost benefit to be gained from conducting short-form FCE as opposed to standard FCE, no evidence was found on the effectiveness of either form in predicting injury recurrence. A more appropriate way to conduct a randomised controlled trial on this topic would be to compare the recurrence following FCE to recurrence after recommendations made by health professionals (medical or allied health) without the use of an FCE.

Quality of the evidence

Since only one randomised controlled study could be reviewed, the findings are regarded as low quality evidence.

Potential biases in the review process

A number of factors contributed to ensuring that any potential bias in the reviewing process was kept to a minimum. Given that we conducted a thorough search of the named databases and screened all lists of references for potential studies, it is unlikely that any studies were missed that would have met the inclusion criteria. There was no language restriction in the search strategy since all

non-English abstracts were translated to determine their suitability for further investigation and possible inclusion. As stated previously, the inclusion criteria themselves were rigorously observed through comparison of any potential study against the predefined checklist.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

We found low quality evidence from one trial that short and long forms of functional capacity evaluation (FCE) result in similar recurrence rates of sickness absence while the short form led to a 43% reduction of time to perform the assessment.

Implications for research

The effectiveness of FCE-based recommendations should be investigated in randomised controlled trials compared to no FCE or alternative recommendations. The rate of or time to recurrence should be used as the primary outcome measure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dawn Payoe from the Health Sciences Library, University of Sydney, provided assistance in the development of the search strategy.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

Gross 2007 {published data only}

Gross DP, Battie MC, Asante AK. Evaluation of a short-form functional capacity evaluation: less may be best. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2007;**17**(3):422–35.

References to studies excluded from this review

Goutteborge 2009 {published data only}

Goutteborge V, Kuijer PPFM, Wind H, Van Duivenbooden C, Sluiter JK, Frings-Dresen MHW. Criterion-related validity of functional capacity evaluation lifting tests on future work disability risk and return to work in the construction industry. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 2009;**66**:10657–63.

Gross 2004a {published data only}

Gross DP, Battie MC. The prognostic value of functional capacity evaluation in patients with chronic low back pain: part 2 - sustained recovery. *Spine* 2004;**29**(8):920–4.

Gross 2004b {published data only}

Gross DP, Battie MC, Cassidy JD. The prognostic value of functional capacity evaluation in patients with chronic low back pain: part 1. *Spine* 2004;**29**(8):914–9.

Gross 2005 {published data only}

Gross DP, Battie MC. Functional capacity evaluation performance does not predict sustained return to work in claimants with chronic back pain. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2005;**15**(3): 285–94.

Gross 2006 {published data only}

Gross DP, Battie MC. Does functional capacity evaluation predict recovery in workers' compensation claimants with upper extremity disorders?. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 2006;**63**(6): 404–10.

Kuijer 2006 {published data only}

Kuijer W, Brouwer S, Reneman MF, Dijkstra PU, Groothoff JW, Schellekens JMH, et al. Matching FCE activities and work demands: an explorative study. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2006;**16**(3):469–83.

Lechner 2008 {published data only}

Lechner DE, Page JJ, Sheffield G. Predictive validity of a functional capacity evaluation: the physical work performance evaluation. *Work* 2008;**31**(1):21–5.

Streibelt 2009 {published data only}

Streibelt M, Blume C, Thren K, Reneman MF, Mueller-Fahrnow W. Value of functional capacity evaluation information in a clinical setting for predicting return to work. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2009;**90**:429–34.

Additional references**Allen 2004**

Allen S, Rainwater A, Newbold A, Deacon N, Slatter K. Functional capacity evaluation reports for clients with personal injury claims: a content analysis. *Occupational Therapy International* 2004;**11**(2): 82–95.

Asante 2007

Asante AK, Brintnell ES, Gross DP. Functional self-efficacy beliefs influence functional capacity evaluation. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2007;**17**(1):73–82.

Busch 2007

Busch H, Goransson S, Melin B. Self-efficacy beliefs predict sustained long-term sick absenteeism in individuals with chronic musculoskeletal pain. *Pain Practice* 2007;**7**(3):234–40.

Downs 1998

Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 1998;**52**(6):377–84.

GRADE Working Group 2004

GRADE Working Group. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2004;**328**:1490–4.

Gross 2006b

Gross DP, Battie MC, Asante A. Development and validation of a short-form functional capacity evaluation for use in claimants with low back disorders. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2006;**16**: 53–62.

Hart 1993

Hart DL, Isernhagen SJ, Matheson LN. Guidelines for functional capacity evaluation of people with medical conditions. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy* 1993;**18**(6):682–6.

Heijbel 2006

Heijbel B, Josephson M, Jensen I, Stark S, Vingard E. Return to work expectation predicts work in chronic musculoskeletal and behavioral health disorders: prospective study with clinical implications. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2006;**16**(2): 173–84.

Higgins 2008

Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2008 Vol. Version 5.0.0 [updated February 2008]:Available from www.cochrane-handbook.org.

Innes 1999

Innes E, Straker L. Validity of work-related assessments. *Work* 1999;**13**(2):125–52.

Isernhagen 1992

Isernhagen SJ. Functional capacity evaluation: rationale, procedure, utility of the kinesio-physical approach. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 1992;**2**(3):157–68.

Johansson 2004

Johansson G, Lundberg I. Adjustment latitude and attendance requirements as determinants of sickness or attendance. Empirical tests of the illness flexibility model. *Social Science and Medicine* 2004;**58**(10):1857–68.

Johansson 2006

Johansson G, Lundberg O, Lundberg I. Return to work and adjustment latitude among employees on long-term sickness absence. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2006;**16**(2):185–95.

King 1998

King PM, Tuckwell N, Barrett TE. A critical review of functional capacity evaluations. *Physical Therapy* 1998;**78**(8):852–66.

Reneman 2004

Reneman MF, Brouwer S, Meinema A, Dijkstra PU, Geertzen JH, Groothoff JW. Test-retest reliability of the Isernhagen Work Systems Functional Capacity Evaluation in healthy adults. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2004;**14**(4):295–305.

Reneman 2005

Reneman MF, Fokkens AS, Dijkstra PU, Geertzen JH, Groothoff JW. Testing lifting capacity: validity of determining effort level by means of observation. *Spine* 2005;**30**(2):E40–6.

Review Manager

The Nordic Cochrane Centre. Review Manager. 5.0. Copenhagen: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2008.

Ruan 2001

Ruan CM, Haig AJ, Geisser ME, Yamakawa K, Buchholz RL. Functional capacity evaluations in persons with spinal disorders: predicting poor outcomes on the functional assessment screening test (FAST). *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2001;**11**(2): 119–32.

Schonstein 2001

Schonstein E, Kenny DT. The value of functional and work place assessments in achieving a timely return to work for workers with back pain. *Work* 2001;**16**(1):31–8.

Soer 2008

Soer R, van der Schans CP, Groothoff JW, Geertzen JH, Reneman MF. Towards consensus in operational definitions in functional capacity evaluation: a Delphi survey. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2008;**18**(4):389–400.

Wyman 1999

Wyman DO. Evaluating patients for return to work. *American Family Physician* 1999;**59**(4):844–8.

* Indicates the major publication for the study

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies [ordered by study ID]

Gross 2007

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Methods | Cluster-randomised controlled trial |
| Participants | 372 claimants (173 for intervention and 199 for control) who were undergoing assessment from the Workers' Compensation Board of Alberta between October 2004 and May 2005 and who were non-systematically assigned to intervention and control group |
| Interventions | Intervention: a 4-hour short-form FCE developed by Gross et al. (2006) comprising selected items from Isernhagen's Work Systems FCE and Ruan et al's (2001) Functional Screening Test, providing separate region-specific protocols for assessments of the trunk, upper extremities and lower extremities according to claimants' diagnoses Control: standard Isernhagen Work Systems FCE involving a more thorough two-day physical assessment |
| Outcomes | Recurrence of sickness absence, based on 1) all recurrences after initial benefit suspension or claim closure, 2) restarting benefits after initial suspension and 3) re-opening or filing of a new claim after initial closure |
| Notes | - |

Risk of bias

| Item | Authors' judgement | Description |
|--|--------------------|---|
| Blinding of study subjects? | Yes | Claimants were blinded from the study and did not know the kind of assessment they received |
| Blinding of outcome assessor? | Yes | Data on readiness to return to work were assessed from claims information from WCB-Alberta administrative databases |
| Results based on "data dredging"? | Yes | No retrospective unplanned subgroup analyses were reported |
| Analyses adjust for different lengths of follow up of workers? | Yes | Analyses were conducted on 12-month follow up only |
| Appropriate statistical test use? | Yes | Independent samples t-test, Cox and logistic regression |
| Compliance with recommendation reliable? | Yes | Therapists from the intervention and control groups assessed claimants' physical ability according to the prescribed assessment |

Gross 2007 (Continued)

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Outcome measures used valid and reliable? | Yes | Recurrence of sickness absence is based on 1) all recurrences after initial benefit suspension or claim closure, 2) restarting benefits after initial suspension and 3) re-opening or filing of a new claim after initial closure |
| Recruitments of participants from the same population? | Yes | Participants for the intervention groups and control group were recruited from the same population; all claimants underwent assessment from October 2004 through to May 2005 |
| Recruitments of participants over the same time period? | Yes | Claimants from both groups were recruited between October 2004 through May 2005 |
| Subjects randomised to intervention groups? | Yes | Cluster-randomisation at the therapist level using a random number generator |
| Adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses? | Yes | More information was obtained on the potential confounders within the compensation databases that might influence future recovery such as age, gender, previous claims, employment status, pre-accident annual salary, scores on the Pain Disability Index and visual analogue pain scale |
| Losses to follow up taken into account? | Yes | There was no loss to follow up |
| Randomised intervention assignment concealed? | No | The therapists were obviously aware of which form of FCE they were conducting |

Characteristics of excluded studies [ordered by study ID]

| Study | Reason for exclusion |
|-------------------|--|
| Gouttebarger 2009 | No control group |
| Gross 2004a | Historical cohort study |
| Gross 2004b | Historical cohort study |
| Gross 2005 | Prospective study design |
| Gross 2006 | No control group |
| Kuijjer 2006 | Explorative prognostic cohort study design |

(Continued)

| | |
|----------------|------------------|
| Lechner 2008 | No control group |
| Streibelt 2009 | No control group |

DATA AND ANALYSES

Comparison 1. Short-form FCE versus standard FCE

| Outcome or subgroup title | No. of studies | No. of participants | Statistical method | Effect size |
|--|----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 All injury recurrences after initial benefit suspension or claim closure | 1 | | Hazard Ratio (Fixed, 95% CI) | Subtotals only |
| 2 Restarting benefits after initial suspension | 1 | | Hazard Ratio (Fixed, 95% CI) | Subtotals only |
| 3 Claims re-open or new claim filing after initial closure | 1 | | Hazard Ratio (Fixed, 95% CI) | Subtotals only |

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 3, 2008

Review first published: Issue 7, 2010

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

NM and ES conducted the study selection, quality assessment, data extraction and data analysis, and drafted the review.

JV and ML conducted the study selection and data analysis, and commented on the review.

ES, JV, MFR, JBF and FS commented on the review.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None known.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

- No sources of support supplied

External sources

- Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Finland.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW

The differences between the protocol and review are as follows:

1. We changed the definition of functional capacity evaluation (FCE) to “evaluation of capacity of activities that is used to make recommendations for participation in work while considering the person’s body functions and structures, environmental factor, personal factors and health status” (Soer 2008 page 394).
2. We have added the word “FCE-based” and “re-” injuries in the Objectives. The new objective is to assess the effectiveness of FCE-based return to work recommendations in preventing occupational re-injuries of injured workers compared with no intervention or alternative interventions.
3. Methods for study selection and extraction differ from the original protocol in their descriptions of who performed them and how disagreement was dealt with.
4. In the protocol, outcome measures were mentioned such as incidence of musculoskeletal disorders or diseases and work status (at work or off work) at follow up.
5. We changed the definition of readiness to return to work to recurrence of sickness absence based on the time of receiving time-loss benefits and the duration of claims.
6. We have graded quality of evidence according to the GRADE criteria.

INDEX TERMS

Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)

*Work Capacity Evaluation; Absenteeism; Recurrence [prevention & control]; Wounds and Injuries [*prevention & control]

MeSH check words

Humans